

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the subject application. The Office Action of December 31, 2003 has been received and contents carefully reviewed. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claim 30.

By this Amendment, Applicants amend the Specification and claims 1, 6, 8, 10, 11, 26 and 31. No new matter has been added to the Specification. Claim 12 - 20 have been withdrawn as the result of an earlier restriction requirement. Accordingly, claims 1-31 are currently pending in the present application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 6-11 because of informalities. Applicants respectfully submit that the objections are not believe to be moot in view of the current amendments in the claims.

In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 21-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶1, as failing to comply with the written description requirement; rejected claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Miyawaki (U.S. Patent No. 5,897,182); rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyawaki in view of Nakamura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,654,777); rejected claims 1 and 6-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyawaki and Nakamura et al. as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Applicant's Related Art ("ARA") and Hsu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,573,964). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The rejection of claims 21-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶1 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the amendments in Paragraph [0053], claims 21-29 are in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶1.

The rejection of claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claim 31 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 31 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "a gate electrode extending from the gate line and having overlapping areas between the gate electrode and the source/drain

electrodes, the gate electrode having means for reducing the overlapping areas whereby a parasitic capacitance is reduced.” None of the cited references teaches or suggests this feature of the present invention.

In the Office Action on page 5, the Examiner states, “...by which said overlap is reduced to zero (cf. col.8, l. 28-30), and whereby inherently the parasitic capacitance caused by said overlap is reduced to zero as well.” Applicants respectfully submit that col. 8, lines 28-30 corresponds to Fig. 11, which illustrates the eighth embodiment of Miyawaki. However, the gate electrode in Fig. 11 is not overlapped by the source and drain electrodes. No other portion of Miyawaki teaches or suggests the features recited by at least claim 31 of the present application.

The rejections of claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a gate electrode having overlapping areas between the gate electrode and the source/drain electrodes and extending from the gate line for opening and closing the channel, wherein the gate electrode includes a head portion, the head portion having an inclined part sloped at a first angle relative to the first straight line direction of the data line and a second angle relative to the second straight line direction of the gate line, the inclined part being unparallel to the gate line.” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, and claims 2-11 and 28-30, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that “in determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under 35 U.S.C. 103 is not whether the differences themselves would have been obvious, but whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious.” See M.P.E.P. § 2141.02.

Applicants respectfully submit that one of the subject matters of the present invention is to reduce the parasitic capacitances (C_{gs} and C_{gd}) by reducing the overlapping areas between the gate electrode and the source and drain electrodes, as recited in claim 1. See paragraph [0087] of the present application. However, Fig. 16 of Miyawaka, for example, discloses that the source electrode 7 is formed using the signal line 3, wherein the signal line 3 almost completely overlaps the gate electrode 1. Applicants respectfully submit that, as best understood, such a

TFT structure in Miyawaka would result in a high parasitic capacitance, for example, Cgs. In view of these distinguishing features, Applicants respectfully submit that Miyawaka, the primary reference in the Office Action, fails to teach or suggest the recited feature.

Claim 21 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 21 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “wherein a first overlapping portion between the source electrode and the gate electrode has a first height and a second overlapping portion between the drain electrode and the gate electrode has a second height, the first height being greater than the second height, the first height of the source electrode and the second height of the drain electrode corresponding to a shape of the semiconductor layer; whereby the shape of the gate electrode reduces the overlapping areas between the gate electrode and the source and drain electrodes to reduce a parasitic capacitance.” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 21 and claims 22-27, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner deems that a telephone conference would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number (202) 496 - 7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the

Application No.: 10/028,304

Docket No.: 8733.517.00-US

filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: March 26, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Rebecca Goldman Rudich

Registration No.: 41,786

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorney for Applicant